EXHIBIT B

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA	
2	CASE NO. 25-CV-20757-JB	
3	JANE DOE,	Miami, Florida
4	Plaintiff,	April 4, 2025
5	VS.	4:37 p.m 4:56 p.m.
6	STEVEN K. BONNELL, II,	Volume 1 of 1
7	Defendant.	
8		Pages 1 to 16
9	CTATUC CONFEDENCE	
10	STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE JACQUELINE BECERRA	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE APPEARANCES:	
12		
13	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	0.0.0000000 0.0000 0.0000
14		CARLOS ALBERTO GARCIA PEREZ ESQ SMGQ Law
15		201 Alhambra Circle Suite 1400 Coral Gables, Florida 33134
16		
17		JOAN PETERS SCHLUMP ESQ JSP Law, LLC
18		4819 West Boulevard Court Naples, Florida 34103
19	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	ANDREW B. BRETTLER ESQ-Zoom Berk Brettler LLP 9119 Sunset Boulevard
20		
21		West Hollywood, California 90069
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 04:52PM 2 04:52PM 3 04:52PM 4 04:52PM 5 04:52PM 6 04:52PM 7 04:52PM 8 04:52PM 9 04:52PM 10 04:52PM 11 04:52PM 12 04:52PM 13 04:52PM 14 04:52PM 15 04:52PM 16 04:52PM 17 04:52PM 18 04:52PM 19 04:52PM 20 04:52PM 21 04:53PM 22 04:53PM 23 04:53PM 24 04:53PM 25 04:53PM

MS. SCHLUMP: We have had discussions with counsel prior to this, and they were not very productive, so I did not think that discussing this matter with them -- I mean Mr. Brettler just said his client is not destroying evidence. We know the client is destroying evidence. We've seen it. So it's just not --

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. When I speak, you have to stop.

MS. SCHLUMP: Sorry. Go ahead. Yes. Sorry.

THE COURT: One, not just because I'm the judge; but two, because my court reporter only writes down what one person says, and I promise it's always what I'm saying if there are two people talking.

My point to you is you can tell them "Your client is destroying evidence." Of course they're going to tell you that he's not; I would hope they're going to say that. Now, if you show them evidence of it, they're probably not going to say "Yeah, he is destroying evidence," but they might talk to their client and come to some agreement with you about what he can and can't do.

So, you know, productivity isn't them acquiescing to your allegation, but you might be able to get some resolution of what he can and can't do in this space in terms of what he can do with his emails and what he can do with his chats. I mean there are so many platforms and things now, I don't even try to keep up with them. Even though I have a teenager and I think I do keep up with

1 04:53PM 2 04:53PM 3 04:53PM 4 04:53PM 5 04:53PM 6 04:53PM 7 04:53PM 8 04:53PM 9 04:53PM 10 04:53PM 11 04:53PM 12 04:53PM 13 04:54PM 14 04:54PM 15 04:54PM 16 04:54PM 17 04:54PM 18 04:54PM 19 04:54PM 20 04:54PM 21 04:54PM 22 04:54PM 23 04:54PM 24 04:54PM

25

04:54PM

them, I don't because there is something new that comes out every day. So whatever platforms he is chatting with people or talking to people on, you know, these things I know are moving targets, but it's always productive to talk.

And let me just say one more thing because it's day -not day one because you filed in February, but we're really early
on in this litigation that will be before me for God knows how
long. You need to confer.

MS. SCHLUMP: Understood.

THE COURT: And you need to confer a lot. I think good lawyers working in good faith can work a lot of things out; and when you can't, that's my job and I'm happy to hear disputes. I obviously love it; otherwise I wouldn't want this job. But the dispute is better and it's easier for the Court and it's fairer for the parties if what's before the Court has really been crystalized by conferral.

So I hear you that these lawyers aren't going to agree with you probably on much when it comes to the substance, but it does help to crystalize the issues if you at least talk to each other. And it's very difficult when they've been sitting with you for an hour talking about the schedule, you never mentioned the TRO and it gets filed, it doesn't help in terms of the lawyers trusting each other to at least bring issues in good faith.

It's a complex case. I understand, you know, it's a sensitive matter for your client, I understand that. But if we

1 want to go forward in a way that's productive going forward, I'm 04:54PM 2 going to encourage you as best you can to talk to the lawyers. 04:54PM 3 Keep talking to the defense lawyers. And I'm not telling you to 04:55PM 4 agree with them, I'm just telling you that to work in good faith 04:55PM 5 to try to bring things to the Court when they have been 04:55PM 6 crystalized and when they have been vetted by both sides. I think 04:55PM 7 that only helps the Court and I think it only helps the parties. 04:55PM 8 So as I said, for purposes of my ruling, I find that the 04:55PM request for a TRO is stale. There is no urgent issue before the 9 04:55PM 10 It can be handled at the preliminary injunction. 04:55PM 11 Because of my court schedule and my trial schedule, it 04:55PM 12 will be referred to the magistrate judge. I would expect that by 04:55PM 13 Monday, you know, his chambers will reach out to you by order or 04:55PM 14 by phone or something or Tuesday maybe to figure out what those 04:55PM 15 dates are and what that schedule is. 04:55PM All right. Anything else on behalf of the plaintiff? 16 04:55PM 17 MS. SCHLUMP: No, Your Honor. 04:55PM 18 THE COURT: On behalf of the defendant? 04:55PM 19 MR. BRETTLER: The only thing, Your Honor, is I will 04:55PM 20 absolutely appear in person at future hearings. The only reason I 04:55PM 21 couldn't is because we only had 18 hours' notice of this one; 04:55PM 22 otherwise, I would have been on an airplane, and appreciate the 04:55PM 23 Court's accommodation. 04:56PM 24 THE COURT: Look, I missed it because I saw Bilzin and I 04:56PM 25 missed that there was an L.A. lawyer on it. And I just wanted to 04:56PM